PB85-214195

Superfund Record of Decision (EPA Region 10) Western Processing Company, Inc. Site Kent, Washington, August 1984

(U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

5 Aug 84

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
NTIS

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of
Emergency and
Remedial Response

EPA/ROD/R10-84/003
August 1984

PB85-214195

EPA

Superfund Record of Decision:

Western Processing Site, WA

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO.	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO.
EPA/ROD/R10-84/003		PB85 214195/AS

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5. REPORT DATE
SUPERFUND RECORD OF DECISION Western Processing, Inc. WA	08/05/84 6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE
7. AUTHOR(S)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Same s box 12.	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 401 M Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20460	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED Final ROD Report 14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE 800/00

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT

The Western Processing site occupies approximately 13 acres in Kent and King Counties, WA. Originally Western Processing was a reprocessor of animal byproducts and brewer's yeast. In the 1960's the business expanded to recycle, reclaim, treat and dispose of industrial wastes, including waste oils, electroplating wastes, waste pickle liquor, battery acids, flue dust, pesticides, spent solvents, and zinc dross. The facility is presently inactive and consists of 10 buildings in poor repair, a solvent recycling plant, a fertilizer-plant, 72 bulk storage tanks of varying capacities, drum storage areas with 2,000 partially filled drums and 3,600 empty drums, piles of flue dust, and battery chips. The soil and ground water samples confirmed that hazardous substances had been released into the environment. Among the more hazardous contaminants found on or below the site are chloroform, benzene, 1,2 -dichloroethane, trichloroethylene, phenol, arsenic, cadmium and cyanides.

The surface clean-up and stormwater control project is the first operable unit of the overall remedial action at the site. The main elements of the selected alternative include: characterize all materials identified for remova; removal of all bulk liquids, drummed liquids, and waste piles to a permitted off-site facility for disposal or incineration; removal and proper disposal of all transformers and substation equipment; demolition and removal to a permitted off-site facility of all on site buildings & dismantling of all on-site bulk storage tanks. Capital Cost $5.0 m.

(Key words attached)

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Record of Decision Western Processing, Inc., WA Contaminated media: gw, soil Key contaminants: oils, acids, solvents, pesticides, VOCs, metals, TCE, DCE, arsenic, cadmium, cyanides		

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS (This Report)	21. NO. OF PAGES
	None	5
	20. SECURITY CLASS (This page)	22. PRICE
	None	$7.00

EPA Form 2220-1 (Rev. 4-77) PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

ENFORCEMENT DECISION MEMORANDUM

FIRST OPERABLE UNIT OF REMEDIAL ACTION SELECTION

Site: Western Processing Company, Inc., King County, Kent, Washington

ANALYSIS REVIEWED

I have reviewed the following documents describing the analysis of the cost-effectiveness for the Phase I remedial measures for the Western Processing Site.

1. Summary of First Operable Unit Remedial Alternative Selection at the Western Processing Site.

2. Draft Final Focused Feasibility Study for Surface Cleanup, June 4, 1984, by CH_2M Hill, and amended on June 15, in the Detailed Analysis Condeptual Design for Surface Cleanup.

3. Proposal for Surface Remedial Activities, prepared by Chemical Waste Management, Inc., ENRAC Division, June 26, 1984, for Western Processing Coordinating Committee.

4. Memorandum dated July 12, 1984, from Robert G. Courson to Jerry Schwartz and Madeline Nawar on Recycling of Liquids from WP during PRP removal.

5. Memorandum dated June 22, 1984, from George Hofer to Judi Schwarz on CSSI Facility in Arlington, OR.

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

The main elements of the selected alternative include:

I. On-site and perimeter monitoring of air quality during remedial activities.

II. Removal of all bulk liquids, drummed liquids, and waste piles to a permitted off-site facility for disposal or incineration.

III. Removal and proper disposal of all transformers and substation equipment.

IV. Demolition and removal to a permitted off-site facility of all on-site buildings.

V. Dismantling of all on-site bulk storage tanks. If tanks are determined to be structurally sound, such tanks will be thoroughly cleaned and sold for scrap metal.

VI. All other surface debris will be removed and disposed.

VII. Stormwater will be controlled and treated prior to discharge before, during, and after the surface cleanup. After the initial pond removal, an on-site treatment plant will be set up and operated.

Each solid waste pile shall be removed down to the existing grade level at the site location on which it was situated. The exception will be the accumulated "gyp" pond pile. Up to 750 cubic yards of soil below existing grade level will be removed in addition to the pile itself. This depression will form a storm water accumulation area for use subsequent to the surface cleanup. Adjacent areas to the South will be graded to provide drainage to the area. The estimated cost for total response action is reported to be approximately $9 million.

DECLARATION

Consistent with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), and the National Contingency Plan (40 CFR Part 300), I have determined that the above remedial measures for the Western Processing Site will effectively mitigate and minimize damage to, and provide for current and future protection of public health, welfare and the environment. The State of Washington has been consulted and agrees with the selected remedy.

I have also determined that the action being taken which includes the off-site transport of contaminated materials to a RCRA approved facility is the least costly alternative when compared to the other remedial options reviewed, and is necessary to protect public health, welfare, or the environemnt.

8/6/84
Date

Lee M. Thomas,
Assistant Administrator
Office of Solid Waste and
Emergency Response